

REFERENCE DEPT.
R830.6 56

Scandinavian Studies

PUBLIC LIBRARY
JUN 23 1944
DETROIT

**Publication of the Society for the
Advancement of Scandinavian Study**

EDITOR

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

University of Kansas

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

AXEL LOUIS ELMQUIST

University of Nebraska

Issued Quarterly in February, May, August, and November

VOLUME 18

MAY, 1944

NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

CARL E. W. L. DAHLSTROM:

- Strindberg's Naturalistiska Sorgespel and Zola's
Naturalism. III. '*Fröken Julie*': Dramatis Per-
sonae 41

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT:

- Old Norse Philological Notes 61

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE:

- The Norsemen at Luna 71

NORMAN L. WILLEY:

- Ibsen's *Möllefoss* 79

REVIEW

JOSEPH ALEXIS:

- Sweden, A Wartime Survey*, edited and published
in Sweden 83
-

Scandinavian Studies is published four times a year (in February, May, August, and November) at the George Banta Publishing Company, 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wis.

Address communications regarding subscription and advertising to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Society, Professor Joseph Alexis, 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wisconsin, or 1811 Pershing Road, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Send manuscripts of contributions and books for review to the Editor, Professor A. M. Sturtevant, 924 Louisiana Street, Lawrence, Kansas. All manuscripts must be presented in type-written form.

Applications for membership in the Society for the Advancement of Scandinavian Study should be addressed to the Secretary-Treasurer, Professor Joseph Alexis, 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wisconsin, or 1811 Pershing Road, Lincoln, Nebraska. The annual dues are \$2.00, of which \$1.90 is for a year's subscription to *Scandinavian Studies*.

Entered as second-class matter May 3, 1918, under the Act of March 3, 1879, at the Post Office at Menasha, Wis.



Scandinavian Studies

VOLUME 18

MAY, 1944

NUMBER 2

STRINDBERG'S 'NATURALISTISKA SORGESPEL' AND ZOLA'S NATURALISM

III. 'FRÖKEN JULIE': DRAMATIS PERSONAE

CARL E. W. L. DAHLSTRÖM

University of Michigan

STRINDBERG has devoted more space in the Foreword to the discussion of *dramatis personae* than to other elements. In this regard he seemingly shows some understanding of Zola's naturalism, for of all the elements *dramatis personae* are the most important. The naturalistic writer's subject matter consists of man and his world, or, to put it more accurately, man in his world. The world must be given a significant place simply because it happens to be the environment in which man lives. Thus Strindberg properly places emphasis on *dramatis personae*. Our analysis should reveal how close he comes to Zola's naturalism or how far he strays from it.

The Figures in General

Fortunately, Strindberg treats *dramatis personae* both in general¹ and in particular. Briefly the general qualifications are as follows: Strindberg looks upon his *dramatis personae* as individuals; that is, they are not marked by single character traits but by the whole human complex of personality. They are products of the past and the present. Thus they are neither good nor evil, objects neither of praise nor of condemnation. Inasmuch as Strindberg describes his Age as one of transition, "mer brådska hystersk än åtminstone den föregående," he has chosen to depict his figures as vacillating and disintegrating.

¹ *Samlade skrifter*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 103-104 (the *Samlade skrifter* will hereafter be referred to in this paper simply by Roman numerals indicating volume number).

While Strindberg speaks generally of complexity of *dramatis personae*, he offers no social or biological index. Yet he knew Zola's opinions and specifications, for he had been personally advised of them in Zola's letter of December 14, 1887, relative to *Fadren*: "Vous savez peut-être que je ne suis pas pour l'abstraction. J'aime que les personnages aient un état civil complet, qu'on les coudoie, qu'ils trempent dans notre air."² In other words, complex figures are as likely to be "des êtres de raison" as those of dominant traits, unless one is careful to provide the social and biological status. Strindberg readily betrays a deviation from the naturalistic setup of Zola when he says, "... och det synes mig icke osannolikt att moderna idéer genom tidningar och samtal även sugit sig ner i de lager, där en domestik kan leva."³ In that statement it is clear that Strindberg is thinking in terms of plausibility rather than actuality, for he does not know about the domestic's acquisition of ideas.

Further, as regards general qualifications, Martin Lamm declares that the drama *Fröken Julie* has gained in artistic merit through Strindberg's more objective control of the figures; that is, he has not directly made use of autobiographical material. But Lamm adds that Strindberg "har varit befriad från det närgångna verklighetskopierande, som faktiskt fördärvar illusionen i flera av hans naturalistiska dramer."⁴ If Lamm's conclusion should prove to be valid, we would know that the figures could not be in harmony with Zola's naturalism. Zola, in truth, wished to create the illusion of actual life, but he was convinced that one could not create such an illusion without taking his materials from actual life. In fact, Zola wanted the figures to be so presented that "un beau jour, on se retrouve dans leurs œuvres, presque avec son nom, avec son geste, ses vêtements, son histoire, ses verrues. On est devenu . . . un document humain. . . ."⁵

In general, the *dramatis personae* of *Fröken Julie* are supposed to be naturalistic. Yet from what Strindberg himself says and from a statement by the outstanding Strindberg scholar

² XXIII, p. 422.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

⁴ *Strindbergs dramer* (Stockholm, 1924), Vol. I, p. 313.

⁵ *Les romanciers naturalistes* (Paris, 1914), p. 313.

Martin Lamm, doubt is engendered in our minds. It is essential to analyze the figures individually if we are to arrive at acceptable judgments.

Julie

Strindberg treats Julie at some length in the Foreword. In his analysis he presents her as a modern figure, the half-woman man-hater who has begun to make a noise. It is a venal type of degenerate stock. It is also a tragic type because it embraces a hopeless fight against nature. More particularly, he tells us that Julie is an offspring of the old warrior nobility that is now giving way to the intellectual nobility. She becomes a victim of circumstances introduced by her own mother. Strindberg explains her suicide on the basis of the sense of honor which compels members of the nobility to eliminate themselves when caught in certain circumstances.⁶ He also refers to her case as an exception.⁷

Strindberg's selection of an exceptional case is in disagreement with Zola's position.⁸ The *dramatis personae* should be representative figures, and it follows that their experiences should be of the kind we recognize as common to human beings.

Despite the factor of exception, however, we may still examine Julie with the object of determining whether or not Strindberg derived her from life, as he says in the Foreword. From various statements, we discover that he has changed the circumstances of the seduction. He abandoned the idea of having the daughter of a nobleman seduce a stableman, and introduced the Count's lackey instead.⁹ Again, Strindberg says that "... fröken Julie kan icke leva utan ära . . .," and thus explains her suicide. The daughters of nobility, of course, prefer death to life without honor. Yet the matter of suicide is not of such necessity, if we can judge by a letter written by Strindberg to Edvard Brandes. As regards the model from which Julie was supposedly taken, Strindberg writes that "... hon icke begått självmord utan tagit plats som 'skänkmamsell på Hasselbacken.'"¹⁰ And

⁶ XXIII, pp. 104-106.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁸ Apropos of *dramatis personae* cf. Zola, *Roman expérimental* (Paris, 1890), pp. 243-244; *Correspondance: Les lettres et les arts* (Paris, 1908), p. 121.

⁹ Lamm, *Strindbergs dramer*, Vol. I, p. 306.

¹⁰ Lamm, *August Strindberg* (Stockholm, 1940), Vol. I, p. 346.

Lamm further tells us that there was much manipulation in the closing scene of *Fröken Julie*.¹¹ Thus, if Strindberg did take Julie from a living model, he felt under no compulsion to abide by his observations. Indeed, he apparently could actually see that a daughter of nobility became a barmaid, after a seduction in real life, but he insisted in the work of literature that such a circumstance required suicide.

Strindberg's analysis of Julie is certainly not scientific, even for the nineteenth century. The half-woman, man-hating female is far more a product of imagination than the result of scientific investigation and the exploitation of established data. It is true that Strindberg is making use of Nietzschean philosophy and of Darwinian lore, but he is using them freely.¹² Moreover, only the Darwinian material, properly employed, would be satisfactory for a naturalistic play. The idea that the male is the stronger,¹³ therefore the more fit to live, and hence the survivor, is a blending of Darwinian and Nietzschean concepts. It is significant for our study that Strindberg makes Julie the weaker of the two, not because of his scientific studies but for the sake of his philosophic concepts.

Although, in his discussion of *dramatis personae* in general, Strindberg declares himself against the kind of figure having but a single dominant trait, he has come perilously close to such portrayal in Julie. He has refused to take the representative person, implying that such a one makes for banality, and has taken an exceptional case, for which he has provided an exceptional figure. Even though Julie is not a literary type, she is fixed in Strindberg's mind as a type; and he has drawn her with but few lines. She is a rutting manhater of the upper social stratum.

That the last offspring of a worn-out family of the genus

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 357.

¹² LIV, pp. 323-324; Lamm, *Strindbergs dramer*, Vol. I, p. 327; Lamm, *August Strindberg*, Vol. I, pp. 347-348, 350, 417-423; Jolivet, *Le théâtre de Strindberg* (Paris, 1931), pp. 139, 146, 172; Jolivet, "Strindberg et Nietzsche," *Revue de litt. comparée*, 19 (1939), pp. 390-406; Karl Strecker, *Nietzsche und Strindberg, mit ihrem Briefwechsel* (Munich, 1921).

¹³ XXIII, p. 107.

Homo sapiens should be a psychological anomaly because of unfavorable environment seems to be one of the principles guiding Strindberg in his analysis of Julie. It is not, however, a principle arrived at by virtue of observation and scientific studies; it is the product of Strindberg's readings—scientific, philosophical, artistic—plus his artistic needs. The drama needed, not a stableman but someone who could wear dress clothes and chatter a bit in French. And it needed a female figure of higher cerebriational index than a nobleman's daughter who could seduce a stableman and then be content as a barmaid.

Martin Lamm opens his discussion of Julie with a rather remarkable statement, if we are thinking of *Fröken Julie* as a naturalistic drama. Lamm says, "Fröken Julie är dock väsentligen en diktad gestalt och som sådan en av Strindbergs allra yppersta."¹⁴ Later on, he also says, "Hon är en problematisk personlighet, men hon bär alltigenom verklighetens prägel." If Lamm's judgment in the first statement is well founded, his judgment in the second statement is without consequence in a study of *Fröken Julie* in terms of Zola's naturalism. Mere plausibility or verisimilitude is not enough; the figures are to be derived from life, not invented by an author.

In his later work, *August Strindberg*, Lamm points to a possible change of attitude on the part of Strindberg toward Julie during the composition of the drama.

Det är möjligt, att Strindberg, då han först tog upp ämnet, kände sig mer befryddad med den nedifrån kommande "artbildaren" Jean. Men under arbetets gång kom han alltmer att dragas mot fröken Julie, med vilken han genom sitt överkänsliga nervsystem kände sig i släkt.¹⁵

Assuredly, when one studies the drama, he observes changes in the two leading figures, although he may not be certain that these are the product of Strindberg's sympathies. The so-called sympathetic feeling for Julie is, in large part, good theatre, that is, in the sense of winning audience support. Julie appeals to Jean for help; she kneels and prays to God; struggling for a release from circumstances, she babbles about her family back-

¹⁴ *Strindbergs dramer*, Vol. I, pp. 313-314.

¹⁵ Vol. I, p. 348.

ground; confused, she appeals to Kristin. Then, finding help nowhere, the unchaste daughter of nobility picks up the razor and walks out of the room with firm step. The woman who goes wrong has long been an object of sympathy in literature, and Strindberg remains within the tradition.

Alfred Jolivet to a considerable extent paraphrases Strindberg's own analysis of Julie in the Foreword. But he also adds that "Il est facile de voir comment cette philosophie se rattache à une des idées maitresses—ou des obsessions—de Strindberg. . . ."¹⁶ This is another way of saying that Lamm is probably right in declaring that Julie is an invented figure, for Jolivet is discussing the 'demifemmes.'

Strindberg (in his Foreword), Lamm, and Jolivet tend to raise doubts in our minds with respect to Julie as a naturalistic figure. If Julie is to be analyzed according to Zola's naturalism, we must turn to the drama itself. If she fulfils Zola's specifications, we should find her adequately presented socially, physiologically, psychologically, and genetically.

We discover that Julie is a young woman of twenty-five years,¹⁷ the daughter of a count.¹⁸ Her father, the Count, remains nameless; hence we do not know Julie's family name. The woman is living on her father's estate¹⁹ without means of her own.²⁰ It is also apparent that her father's financial position is none too good.²¹ In behavior she seemingly takes after her mother,²² a woman of plebeian stock who did not want to marry or to have children.²³ The mother was a man-hater and exacted from Julie the promise that she would never be a man's slave.²⁴ Up to the opening of the drama Julie had kept her promise insofar as she had not yet married, although she had been engaged to a district attorney and had broken off the engagement just two weeks prior to the opening action in the drama.²⁵

¹⁶ *Le théâtre de Strindberg*, p. 171.

¹⁷ XXIII, pp. 115, 134.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 120.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 157-159.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

The mother brought her daughter up like a boy. Julie wore boy's clothing, tended the horses, currying them and harnessing them. She went hunting, and an effort was made to teach her agriculture.²⁶ Julie recognizes that she is something of a social misfit and, peculiarly enough, blames her father: "... det är han som uppfostrat mig till förakt för mitt eget kön, till halvkvinna och halvman!"²⁷ At the time of the drama Julie is presumably garbed in woman's attire, but we know very little about her dress. Late in the drama, a stage direction informs us that Julie appears dressed for traveling,²⁸ but Strindberg offers no details whereby we might be enlightened.

We know very little about the woman's schooling. It would seem that a girl brought up to do man's work would have little time for the so-called cultural education usually given to upper-class women. It is true that Jean speaks of Julie as "bildad," but we realize that he is flattering her for a purpose.²⁹ We note that she has some knowledge of French and hence must have had some kind of tutoring.³⁰ It is doubtful if Julie has traveled in foreign countries, for she seems to be so completely deceived by Jean's enthusiastic talk about Switzerland and the Italian lake country.³¹ For the most part, we are expected to assume that Julie, as the daughter of a count, has been equipped with the kind of schooling generally accorded women of quality, even though we are told that she had the training usually given to boys.

Julie uses perfume.³² Despite this accent on delicacy she is not as clean as one might think,³³ and in this respect she again reminds us of her mother.³⁴ Indeed, although Julie is an aristocrat, she reveals tastes lower than those of the servant.³⁵

Religiously and morally Julie is sketched very faintly. Her kneeling in prayer³⁶ is a theatrical gesture, which cannot qualify

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 171.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 144-147, 161-162, 177-179.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 122, 124, 154.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 154, 172.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 120.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 128, 132, 150.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 151.

her in religion; and her prattling later on about not putting the blame on Jesus and that Kristin with money in the savings bank will not get to heaven³⁷—all this is too much like an echo from the author rather than a plausible response on the part of Julie. The moral index is found in part by her improper approaches to Jean³⁸ and in part by her sense of remorse.³⁹ Likewise, there are genuine doubts about her earlier relations with men. Note, for example, this passage:

Jean. . . . Kanske i botten det inte är så stor skillnad, som man tror, mellan
mänskor och människor!

Fröken. Å skäms! Inte lever vi som ni, när vi äro fästfolk.

Jean (fixerar henne). Är det säkert det?—Ja, för mig är det inte värt att
fröken gör sig oskyldig. . . .

Fröken. Det var en usling, som jag skänkte min kärlek.

Jean. Det säger ni alltid—efteråt.

Fröken. Alltid?

Jean. Jag tror alltid, efter som jag har hört uttrycket flera gånger förut vid
enahanda tillfälle.

Fröken. Vad för tillfälle?

Jean. Som ifrågavarande! Siste gången. . . .⁴⁰

Julie knows quite well that Jean and Kristin are engaged, after the fashion of servants, and she realizes that Kristin is thus Jean's mistress.⁴¹ The passage just quoted certainly provides reason for believing that Julie was not innocent before she set out to tease or seduce Jean.

This is as much as we can say about Julie with regard to social qualifications. It is obvious, of course, that she does not have that complete civil status that Zola specified. While it is true that the spectator in the theatre may have the illusion that he knows a great deal about Julie, an analysis of the text fails to support the illusion.

From the standpoint of physical appearance there is little that we can say about Julie. We know nothing about her complexion. Jean's statement that she is "pale as a corpse"⁴² is made

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

³⁸ See *Scandinavian Studies*, Vol. 18 (1944), pp. 23-24.

³⁹ XXIII, pp. 149, 151, 164, 173.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 140-141.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 125, 128.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 172.

after Julie has been up all night. Furthermore, we know nothing about her general proportions, height, weight, build. Jean does say that she is stately, and from the comment we might gather that Julie is somewhat above average height and not too heavy of build. At the same time, however, we must keep in mind that Jean's qualifications are in part a product of his physical excitement; hence, we must take *cum grano salis* his remarks about Julie's stateliness, elegant shoulders, lovely cheeks, beauty, and the like.⁴³ Certainly much is left to the imagination as regards the woman's appearance.

For the purposes of motivation Strindberg has introduced a physiological condition, catamenia. Archibald Henderson questions this factor because he cannot find it employed: "... The preface is a tricky means of eking out the deficiencies of the play. It may well be imagined that Julia would never have yielded had it not been for her condition; yet never a hint of it is found in the play itself."⁴⁴ Henderson probably read an unsatisfactory translation of *Fröken Julie*, for we find in the Swedish text a euphemism that cannot readily be overlooked. When Jean speaks to Kristin about Julie's improper conduct in dancing with the servants and asks Kristin what she thinks of it, the cook replies, "Ack, det är ju hennes tider nu, och då är hon ju alltid så där konstig."⁴⁵

With respect to heredity Strindberg has introduced nothing that is scientifically acceptable. Even if Julie's remote ancestor was a miller whose wife slept with a king,⁴⁶ there are no biological data offered, both the miller and the king remaining genetic unknowns. Lamm refers to Julie's telling Jean about her family background as "Strindbergs offer åt de naturalistiska fordringarna på vetenskaplighet, på ärftlighets- och miljöförklaringar."⁴⁷ Strindberg, however, presents only the milieu. There is no figure at all comparable to Adelaïde, that prime ancestor of the Rougons and Macquarts in Zola's series of novels. Adelaïde inherited a mental defect from a parent, and she transmitted that

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 120, 154, 155.

⁴⁴ *European Dramatists* (New York, 1926), p. 51.

⁴⁵ XXIII, p. 124.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

⁴⁷ *Strindbergs dramer*, Vol. I, p. 317.

defect to certain of her descendants. Strindberg actually leaves us completely in the dark regarding Julie's heredity. If he wishes us to believe that, on her father's side, Julie is the offspring of a bastard line first established by a king sleeping with a miller's wife, he has presented some interesting gossip about a couple of Julie's progenitors, but nothing more. Again, all the material about Julie's father, mother, and the latter's lover pertains to the environment but not in the least to heredity.

Without question it is the psychological side that Strindberg desires to stress, for he implies that *Fröken Julie* is "ett modernt psykologiskt drama. . . ." ⁴⁸ Throughout the drama, Julie shows no sign of self-restraint and perhaps may be considered as lacking emotional balance. The unfavorable environment of her family and her immediate physical condition largely explain her action. In addition, the contact with Jean and the drinking of beer and wine add to her excitement and confusion. Indeed, when we study the motivation provided by Strindberg, we can say that under most of the circumstances even a so-called normal woman might appear to be emotionally unbalanced on this particular Midsummer's Night.

Of course, Julie may wander from normality, for she has developed an intense hatred for the male. It is cultivated rather than native to her, for when Jean asks her if she hates men she replies, "Ja!—För det mesta! Men ibland—när svagheten kommer, å fy!" ⁴⁹ As a consequence of this war between her instinctive response to the male and the response determined by the conditioning acquired in her home, Julie is frustrated. Her scornful treatment of the district attorney, her fiancé, is opposed by seductive approaches made to Jean. The tenderness occasionally manifested to Jean is set off by an animal rage against him, for she could kill him as though he were a mad dog, ⁵⁰ and " . . . jag tror jag skulle kunna dricka ur din huvudskål . . . jag skulle kunna äta ditt hjärta helstekt!" ⁵¹ Such a hatred is obviously not normal.

Again, Julie shows a lack of balance in the matter of honor.

⁴⁸ XXIII, p. 114.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 160.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

She evinces a total lack of honor before the seduction and so comports herself that the servants talk about her wildness. Yet she is afterwards compelled by honor to kill herself.

What kind of creature is this? Strindberg, who was not in a position to distinguish between conditioned reflexes and traits produced genetically, looked upon the environment as a factor of heredity. Or perhaps we should say that he failed to distinguish between that which is transmitted through protoplasm and that which is acquired through association. We may say that in Julie Strindberg dimly sensed the frustration arising because of the quarrel within Julie's own psyche, but he chose to interpret her as a special type of human being. Thus, figures like Julie are depicted by him as wavering and disintegrating because of biological instead of social failure. Julie is actually related to *dramatis personae* of Strindberg's so-called expressionistic dramas, for her apparently abnormal conduct springs from frustration.

We cannot say that Strindberg, in the figure of Julie, anticipated Freud and Pavlov. Rather, he has given a figure that could be interpreted by the two. Had he been able to be objective and scientific in his observations, Strindberg might actually have accomplished what Zola set forth in his *Roman expérimental*—he might have made a contribution to social science as well as to literature in *Fröken Julie*.

As regards literary sources, I have already discussed the close relationship between Julie and Maria in *En dâres försvarstal*.⁵² In a footnote Martin Lamm points to another literary relationship, to Helène of the short story *Mot betalning*.⁵³ Helène's rearing is much like Julie's. Her father was a general and he was the one who brought her up. She went everywhere with him.⁵⁴ Although she observed that all the men held rank under her father and showed him respect, she also noted that her father showed the same kind of respect to all women, young and old. Thus she developed a notion of female superiority. Accordingly, her upbringing led to false conclusions about men and women. It is rather striking that in *Fröken Julie* Strindberg re-

⁵² See *Scandinavian Studies*, Vol. 18 (1944), pp. 18-25.

⁵³ XIV, pp. 302-337.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 302.

fers to "fadrens oriktiga uppfostran av flickan,"⁶⁶ and in the drama has Julie hold her father responsible for her upbringing,⁶⁶ although there is no sign of the Count's responsibility for Julie's rearing. The Count, of course, could be accused of permitting himself to be so dominated by his wife that Julie was badly reared,⁶⁷ but Strindberg was apparently thinking of a more direct blame. It is quite possible that he had Helène in mind when he wrote about the Count's responsibility.

Helène's experience with her thoroughbred mare is as unpleasant as Julie's with the bitch Diana. Alice, the mare, runs astray with the black stallion of a common miller even as Diana gets mixed up with a servant's pug dog. Just as Helène will have nothing more to do with the animal, so Julie turns to her finch after Diana has been "untrue" to her.⁶⁸ In both cases the seeming affection of the women for domestic animals is opposed by abnormal reactions toward men.

On the days of festivity, "såsom Midsommardagen och generalens födelsedag," the common people were called "upp på herrgården att tjänstgöra som kören i Operan, anställa hurrarop och dansa, såsom figurer i tavlan."⁶⁹ It is just such an occasion that Strindberg employs to ensnare Julie in a sex situation. It is clear that Strindberg borrows freely from his short story *Mot betalning*, for the servants in *Fröken Julie* come up to the Manor to dance on Midsummer's Night, and they act as a kind of chorus, although Strindberg calls this scene of *Fröken Julie* a ballet.

Although Helène is clearly a model for Julie, she does not meet the same fate, for Helène is consistent in her hatred of men. Unlike Julie, she is apparently never attracted by sex. She marries a 'docent' only with the full understanding that there will be no consummation of the marriage. When at last she yields to her husband, who has in the meantime become a professor and a member of parliament, she does so "mot betalning." Helène wants to use him in forwarding the cause of women in parliament. It is thus not the womanly weakness of a Julie that drives

⁶⁶ XXIII, p. 102.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 157-159.

⁶⁸ XIV, p. 307; XXIII, p. 173.

⁶⁹ XIV, p. 305.

her at times to the man; on the contrary, it is a transaction, coldly calculated.

By and large, the evidence is strongly against the idea that Julie is a figure derived from a human model, a woman objectively studied by Strindberg. Helène in *Mot betalning*, Maria in *En dâres försvarstal*, and Julie in *Fröken Julie* are so much alike that we cannot ignore their relationship. Indeed, we cannot escape the conviction that, despite Strindberg's declaration about the model in life, Julie is purely a literary figure; and that conviction is not shaken either by the factor of plausibility or the relationship to Strindberg's own life.

We have looked at Julie from several angles. Her civil status is far from complete, the social qualifications being inadequate. Her heredity is almost wholly a secret, and we know very little about her physiologically. From the viewpoint of psychology, we may say that Julie is far more a product of Strindberg's obsessions about the female than of scientific investigation and observation. While it is possible that Julie is a distorted portrait of Strindberg's first wife, it is more likely that she has been derived from Maria and Helène, dramatis personae employed earlier by Strindberg. Most assuredly Julie is not a figure presented in accordance with Zola's specifications. She is an invented figure, as Lamm tells us.

Jean

At the close of Strindberg's discussion of Julie, in the Foreword, we note that Julie cannot live without honor. Jean, however, has no such handicap, being of low origin. Strindberg tells us that with Jean, who is supposedly ascending the social scale as Julie descends, one remarks differentiation. This last term apparently means "the separation or discrimination of parts or organs which in simpler forms of life are more or less united," or, in another definition, "modification of different parts of the body for performance of particular functions; specialization of parts of organs."⁶⁰ Quite obviously, Strindberg is making free use of the Darwinian material on evolution, because he is giving

⁶⁰ Darwin, *Origin of Species* (Harvard Classics, Vol. 11, New York, 1909), p. 533. Webster's *International Dictionary* (1934).

it a social connotation. Jean began life as the son of a cottier, and, according to Strindberg, he is headed for the social position of hotel owner. Jean learns easily and has keenly developed senses of smell, taste, and vision. In addition, he has a sense of beauty. Having mounted a few rounds above his own class, he has inspired his associates with jealousy. Inasmuch as Jean is emerging from the lowest stratum and struggling toward the highest, he is qualified by a mixed character, partaking of the aristocrat and the slave.⁶¹

A Nietzschean influence appears in Strindberg's stress on Jean's advantage as a male. He is thus in the matter of sex already an aristocrat, a superior person. We note, however, a confusion in the Strindbergian material. On the one hand—the pseudo-Darwinian—Jean is at the point where differentiation can be observed, and this purportedly explains his finely developed senses. On the other hand, it would seem that his masculinity alone was sufficient to provide him with the finely developed senses and initiative. Jean is inferior only because of accident—the social milieu in which he lives. But he is able to slough off the milieu in the same way that he sheds the lackey's uniform and puts on a dress coat.

There seems to be little in this Foreword that would encourage us to view Jean as a figure derived from life, analyzed scientifically, and presented objectively on the stage. There is no science here. The biological status is Strindberg's unabashed employment of a specific set of data for a totally different set of conditions. As a consequence, Jean is without genuine biological status. Socially and psychologically, we also learn little about Jean from the Foreword.

Lamm discusses Jean in his relations to Julie, Kristin, and the Count. He thinks that Jean shows his true self to Kristin but that he is posing in the scene with Julie. To a great extent Lamm puts his stamp of approval on Strindberg's interpretation of this figure. Lamm speaks loosely, of course, when he refers to Jean's "medfödd vulgaritet" in opposition to his "fina fasoner och tänkesätt."⁶² We shall take for granted that Lamm is using the

⁶¹ XXIII, pp. 106-107.

⁶² *Strindbergs dramer*, Vol. I, pp. 314-315.

term "medfödd" to indicate Jean's genuine self, for vulgarity, whether baseness or commonness, is a social characteristic that cannot really be "medfödd." The contrast between Jean's essential vulgarity and his fine manners is, however, no index to his social class. While it is true that little men may strut like conquerors, it is also true that lords may act like louts.

Jolivet too quickly accepts Strindberg's analysis of Jean. "Bref, c'est le type exact du parvenu, tel qu'on le rencontre dans les salons de la meilleure société: Strindberg a donné de ce caractère dans sa préface une analyse détaillée, à laquelle il n'y a rien à ajouter."⁶³ It is always well, however, to check the figure of the drama against the discussions presented by Strindberg.

Jean is a man-servant whose duties are chiefly related to attending the Count as a valet.⁶⁴ He is thirty years old.⁶⁵ He was born in the region of the Count's estate, the son of a cottier.⁶⁶ Although he has had but little formal schooling, he has acquired a social veneer by listening to society folk, reading novels, attending the theatre, and working in another country—Switzerland—where he learned to speak French.⁶⁷ He wears his clothes well and actually looks the part of a gentleman when he sheds his lackey's uniform and puts on a frock coat and bowler hat.⁶⁸ He is a good talker⁶⁹ and also dances well.⁷⁰

Jean is just a servant; hence he has no surname.⁷¹ Unfortunately, Julie has no surname either, as far as we are concerned, with the result that class distinction is not genuinely emphasized by this detail. There is, of course, socially a positive difference between the servant and Julie,⁷² although his tastes seem to be superior to hers.⁷³ Jean feels superior to the rest of the servants and employs the pejorative "packet" in referring to them;⁷⁴ yet he respects the Count and is afraid of him.⁷⁵ The serving man

⁶³ *Le théâtre de Strindberg*, p. 171.

⁶⁴ XXIII, pp. 115, 117, 136.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 126-127, 139-140, 186.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 126, 139.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 122, 123, 125.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 146.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 141, 143.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 146, 185.

desires to get up in the world and thus may be referred to as a potential climber or parvenu.⁷⁶ As he has no surname, so he has no ancestors, for no records are kept of people like his forebears.⁷⁷

Perhaps this is as much as we might reasonably expect regarding the social analysis of a servant. Yet, inasmuch as Jean plays one of the two leading roles, I am convinced that Zola would have required more detailed information about him. The servant's name Jean may be a camouflage for Strindberg's own first name, Johan; but one may wonder, in the interests of naturalism, if Swedish serving men in the households of nobility were wont to have French names. Or, if Strindberg intended this as another affectation on the part of Jean—a 'Johan' who had gone to Switzerland but had returned as a Jean—he failed to mention it.⁷⁸ As regards names, Jean is thus as unsatisfactory as Julie.

We know more about Jean's clothes than about Julie's. He is first dressed in a lackey's uniform, then in frock coat and bowler. This, I suspect, was a necessary move on the part of the author in order to take the attention of the audience from Jean's status as lackey. The audience is not well acquainted with Jean, but Julie is. Hence we may reasonably ask if the change of coat is not a device to build up Jean's appearance and temporarily to provide him with the outlines of the romantic hero. A lady of quality might well respond to a lackey in dress clothes, but certainly the audience would not understand the response, or perhaps not sympathize with the response, if the lackey remained in uniform. It should be noted that Jean's frock coat is hanging not in his room but in the kitchen, a most convenient location for a quick change. We realize, of course, that he needs the bowler to complement the frock coat, but we may ask if in the eighties in Sweden a servant would appear in the kitchen wearing a bowler in the presence of the lady of the house. Owing to the lack of stage directions, we could assume that Jean, like a certain moronic figure of the American comic strips, wears the bowler

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 132-133, 139, 145-147.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

⁷⁸ We remember the affectations of Holberg's leading figure in *Jean de France*.

throughout the action of the drama. Actually we do not know very much about Jean's clothes, for much is left to the discretion of the actor or of the stage director.

Apparently Jean runs around with a railroad timetable in his pocket.⁷⁹ Had the timetable been in the pocket of the livery coat, we might well understand the circumstances. Jean had earlier driven the Count to the railway station, and it is conceivable that he should have a timetable in his possession. But in drawing it out of his frock coat—there is no hint of his having changed back to livery—Jean is fulfilling the needs of the author at the expense of plausibility, let alone actuality.

We know nothing definitely about Jean's appearance. Julie seems to admire him in frock coat and bowler, and she comments on his "fördelaktigt utseende";⁸⁰ yet these are rather indefinite qualifications. Whether paunchy or slim, Jean still might look like a gentleman; again, even though he is an excellent dancer, we cannot guess at his appearance, for fat men often dance lightly and some slim men are heavy on their feet. He is well-muscled, we judge, for Julie feels of his arm and then says, "sådana armar!"⁸¹ In view of the comments made as well as the action, we accept his masculinity as Donjuanesque rather than Josephian.

In the Foreword Strindberg mentions Jean's dual character,⁸² but the drama itself does not reveal much if any of this phase of the man's personality. Jean, a lackey, sheds his livery, puts on a frock coat, and, up to the so-called seduction, acts the part of a gentleman resisting a woman's approaches. After the seduction Jean is clearly on the defensive against this woman who led him on in the face of his own warnings and protests. By her act, Julie has lost her authority over Jean as mistress of the household, and he can afford to be rude, unfeeling, and cruel. The Count, however, has undergone no change in status, with the consequence that Jean naturally cringes at the sound of the Count's voice.

⁷⁹ XXIII, p. 145.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 106.

The analysis of Jean's personality is, indeed, rather skimpy for a "psykologiskt drama." His affectations⁸³ are of a kind that we should expect to find associated with a servant who was in constant attendance on people of quality, a simple matter of association. His recurring dream,⁸⁴ revealing eroticism and ambition, is a convenient contrast to Julie's recurring dream. It is part of the author's pattern-making, not an aspect of the analysis of Jean's personality.

We have already observed that Jean has no ancestors on record. Thus, it is wholly impossible for Strindberg to analyze Jean from the standpoint of heredity. Indeed, the biological side is entirely lacking, Strindberg's adaptation of Darwin notwithstanding.

As we analyze Jean's relations with Julie, we begin to understand more and more just what Strindberg was doing with the servant. We note how much Jean is like his literary counterpart, Axel, of *En dâres försvarstal*, as regards the matter of seduction. Jean is virtually exculpated before the act occurs. Like Axel, Jean repeatedly resists the advances made by the woman and admonishes her to conduct herself better. Of course, like Axel again, he finally takes the woman.

What could Zola say about Jean and naturalism? He would have to reply that Jean, like the figures in *Fadren*, is an abstraction. In truth, he is as much a "diktad gestalt" as Julie. The evidence of the drama itself permits no other conclusion.

Kristin

In his analysis of Kristin, Strindberg shows that he is quite conscious of Zola's implication that the Captain and Laura in *Fadren* are abstractions. Unfortunately, Strindberg evades the question so far as it concerns the leading figures and applies it only to the supporting characters. It would almost seem that he is attempting to divert attention from the abstractness of the leads through protesting that the supporting figures of necessity fail to get full development. Thus, he tells us little more than

⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp. 119, 146-147, 150.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 132-133.

that Kristin is a female slave, dulled by her constant work at the kitchen stove, and presented only partially.⁸⁵

Martin Lamm analyzes Kristin at greater length.⁸⁶ While he declares that "Kristin är naturligtvis intet annat än en typ. . ." he insists that she is rather representative of a certain phase of Swedish national character. In fact, his analysis arouses in us the hope that Kristin may fulfil some of the requirements for naturalistic *dramatis personae*.

In the drama itself, we observe that Strindberg takes pains to tell us that Kristin "är klädd i ljus bomullsklädning och har ett köksförkläde framför sig."⁸⁷ Later on, in a brief pantomime while Jean and Julie are dancing, Kristin "... lägger . . . av sig köksförklädet, tar fram en liten spegel ur en bordslåda, ställer den mot syrenkrukan på bordet; tänder ett talgljus och värmer en hårnål, varmed hon krusar håret i pannan."⁸⁸ Thus, early in the drama, we have a good picture of Kristin as regards clothes and certain of her mannerisms. Later on, we discover that her little household thefts have nothing to do with her religion.⁸⁹ So too, as the mistress of Jean, she is living according to the code of her social class, and she suffers neither from moral nor from religious twinges of conscience. When she learns that Julie is no better than she is, Kristin feels that she must look for employment elsewhere—the servant must be able to retain respect for members of the upper social stratum.

Kristin is thirty-five years old.⁹⁰ Like the other figures in the drama, she has no surname. We know nothing about her forebears or even her immediate family. Inasmuch as she is a subordinate figure, it is of little consequence what her background is. What is significant, however, is that Strindberg has made her less of an abstraction than either Julie or Jean. That is due, I surmise, to the fact that she has not been tampered with in order to give the appearance of being satisfactory to naturalistic analysis.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

⁸⁶ *Strindbergs dramer*, Vol. I, pp. 315–316.

⁸⁷ XXIII, p. 117.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 124.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 181–182.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

Conclusion

This analysis has already presented conclusions regarding the *dramatis personae* of *Fröken Julie*. Lamm's statement anent Julie, that she is an invented figure, applies also to Jean. Only Kristin is apparently not invented, and she is a minor figure and hence incomplete.

There is nothing in *Fröken Julie* to lead us to the conclusion that Strindberg has successfully employed Zola's principles of naturalism as regards the presentation of *dramatis personae*. The more one studies the drama, the more apparent it becomes that Strindberg has made only superficial concessions to Zola's naturalism. Fundamentally, Julie and Jean are products of the imagination, not figures derived from an objective study and disinterested report of human beings.

OLD NORSE PHILOLOGICAL NOTES

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT
University of Kansas

I. Compounds with the Suffix *-gi(-ki)*

(a) *The Lack of gi(-ki)-Umlaut*

Through association with the simplex form the radical vowel escaped the influence of the *gi*-umlaut (cf. *hvat*: *hvat-ki*, *hver*: *hver-gi*, *ulfr*: *ulf-gi*, etc.). This associative influence probably had its point of departure in the pronominal type *hvat-ki*, etc., where the suffix *-gi* had an indefinite force, and then spread to the substantive type *ulf-gi*, *mat-ki*, etc., where the suffix *-gi* had a purely negative force. This assumption is based upon the fact that the interrogative pronoun was likewise used in an indefinite sense (cf. *hvat*=Germ. *was* 'something, anything'); consequently, the suffix *-gi* simply served to enhance the indefinite force of the pronoun (cf. *hvat* 'anything': *hvat-ki* 'anything whatsoever'). In this type (*hvat*: *hvat-ki*) simplex and compound were synonymous except for the intensified indefinite force of the latter. That the radical vowel escaped the influence of the *gi*-umlaut because of this semantic associative influence is borne out by the example of the doublet *hvar-gi* 'anywhere whatsoever': *hver-gi* (<*hvar-gi*) 'nowhere.' Where the suffix *-gi* had a negative force the radical vowel *a* underwent the regular phonetic process, whereby the negative sense of the suffix was differentiated from its indefinite force.

In regard to the compound *þey-gi* 'nevertheless, not at all,' it is probable that this form was not based upon the simplex *þó* 'nevertheless.' The form *þey-gi* may be derived from **þau-gi* (**þau*=Goth. *þau*), whereas the simplex *þó* is derived from **þōh* < **þauh*=Goth. *þauh*. The difference in the radical vowels **au*:*ō* tended to weaken the association between compound and simplex, hence the phonetically correct form *þey-gi* instead of analogical **þó-gi* after the pattern of *þó*.

(b) *The Nom. Sing. Form Mann-gi* 'No One'

It should be noted that the form of the pronominal simplex is *maðr*, never *mann(r)*. The compound form *mann-gi* (<**mannr*, nom. sing. + *-gi*) must therefore have been of earlier origin than the simplex *maðr*, i.e., before the time when the ending *-r* (<**r*)

was restored in *mannr* > *maðr*, for **maðr-gi* would have yielded **mað-gi*.

II. Compounds with Suffixed *-þu* < *-þú* 'Thou'

Both Noreen¹ and Heusler² state that the *u* in suffixed *-þu* does not cause *u*-umlaut (cf. *farþu*, imp. sing., 'go thou'). Such a statement is misleading in that it implies a phonetic reason for the failure of the *u*-umlaut to operate. As a matter of fact, this failure is due to the associative influence of the simplex form (cf. *far þú:farþu*, *skalt þú:skaltþu*); hence it would be far better to say, instead of "... bewirkt keinen Umlaut" (Noreen) or "... labialisiert nicht" (Heusler), "Beim suffigierten *þu* fehlt der Umlaut (die Labialisierung) unter dem Einfluss des Verbal-simplexes."

III. The Element *-blindi* in the Compounds *Hel-*, *Her-*, *Gunn-blindi*, *Epithets of Odin*

Since the element *-blindi* in these epithets does not mean 'The Blind One,' as, e.g., in the epithet *Gestum-blindi*³ 'The Not-blind Guest,' but 'He who makes blind (in death, army, battle), The Blinder,'⁴ the form *-blindi* cannot represent the weak substantivized adjective (= Goth. *blindā*) but must represent a *nomen agentis* from the causative verb *blinda* (= Goth. *blindjan*) 'to make blind, to blind.' The occasional substitution of the strong form of the adjective (*-blindr*) for *-blindi* in these epithets indicates that the *nomen agentis* *-blindi* ('The Blinder') was confused with the weak substantivized adjective *-blindi* ('The Blind One') because of their identity in form.

IV. The Diminutive Force of the Suffix *-ung*

The suffix *-unga* in Gmc originally had a diminutive⁵ force

¹ *Aisl. Grm.*⁴, §80, Anm. 2: "Suffigiertes *þu* du bewirkt keinen Umlaut, z. b. *farþu* fahre."

² *Aisl. Elementarb.*³, §70: "Das suffigierte *þu* "du" aber labialisiert nicht: *farþu* "fahre du."

³ Cf. Axel Kock, *Arkiv*, Vol. VII (1891), p. 180.

⁴ Cf. *Heimskr.*, chap. I, 17; also Gering's discussion of the epithet *Hel-blinde* in Sijmons-Gering, *Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda*, Vol. I (1927), p. 211.

⁵ Cf. Friedrich Kluge, *Nominale Stammbildungslehre der altgerm. Dialekte* (Halle, an der Saale, 1926), §55, and Alexander Jóhannesson, *Die Suffixe im Isländischen* (Halle, an der Saale, 1927), §122.

but came to be used most extensively to denote 'relationship' or 'origin.' The preservation of the diminutive force of the suffix *-unga* must have been favored in ON *-ung*—especially when used with reference to living creatures—by the fact that the suffix *-ung* was identical in form with the adjective *-ung* 'young'; cf. *pilt-ungr* 'a young boy': Norw. *gult-unge* 'a young boy' (*-unge* < ON *-ungi*, substantivized weak form of the adjective *-ungr* 'young,' cf. Germ. *Junge*), *sil-ungr* '(young) little salmon, trout,' *sumr-*, *velr-ungr* '(young) animal that has lived one summer, one winter,' *lein-ungr* '(young) small branch, twig,' etc. In many such diminutives the idea of 'origin' is also apparent, e.g., in *horn-ungr* 'child of illegitimate birth' (cf. OE *hornung-sunu*).

V. The Labialization of $e > \phi$ in **Tegur > Tøgr* 'Ten'?

According to Noreen⁶ the ϕ in *tøgr* is the result of the labialization of e (through the influence of the u of the end syllable in **legur*), which took place in the adjectival compound because of lack of stress (cf. *þri-*legur > -tøgr* 'three years old') and which was then transferred to the (accented) simplex (*tøgr* 'ten'). But since there are no unequivocal examples⁷ of the labialization of $e > \phi$ through the influence of an u (= PG u , not the semivowel w, v, u) of the end syllable, either in accented⁸ or in unaccented syllables, except in conjunction with a labial consonant (r, l, m, b , etc.) preceding the radical vowel (i.e., combined labialization), we are justified in doubting the correctness of Noreen's theory. With the exception of *tøgr*, all Noreen's examples of the labialization of $e > \phi$ through the influence of PGmc u of the end syllable represent combined labialization. With *rerum > rørum*, an example quoted by Noreen, compare *erum* (never **ørum* with

⁶ Cf. Noreen, *op. cit.*, §77, 3: " $e > \phi$ (geschlossenes) tritt nur dann ein, wenn e . . . nicht gebrochen werden konnte, . . . in nicht haupttoniger Silbe, z.b. *tul-, þritøgr* u. dgl. 2, 3 dekaden enthaltend aus **leguR* (danach das simplex *tøgr* statt **tiogr*, aschw. *tiugher* dekade) . . ."

⁷ The form *gøgnum*, over against *gegnum*, does not represent an unequivocal example of this labialization, for the ϕ in *gøgnum* may be due to the further labialization of q in *gognum* (< **gaginum*).

⁸ Cf. Heusler, *op. cit.*, §68: "Für die Umfärbung von starktonigen e - und i -Lauten durch reinen u -Umlaut gibt es keine eindeutigen Belege." Nor does Heusler give any examples of this labialization in unaccented syllables.

labialization, yet naturally atonic in character). Unlike such verbal forms as *sþrum*, *snþrum*, the substantive verb *erum* did not stand under the influence of the reduplicating type *rerum* > *rþrum* (with combined labialization).

On the other hand, a more satisfactory explanation of the vowel ϕ in *tþgr* is to assume that the ϕ was due not to the labialization of *e* in **legur* but to the *i*-umlaut of *o* > ϕ , which was leveled out in the paradigm of the form *logr* in favor of those forms in which the *i*-umlaut occurred (viz., *tþgi*, dat. sing.; *tþgir*, nom. plur.; *tþgi*, acc. plur.). With *tugr:logr:tþgr* compare *sunr:sunr:sþnr*. This explanation of *tþgr* as an analogical form seems preferable to Noreen's in that the latter is without any convincing parallel.

VI. *The Suffix -d- in the Form Ol-d-a, Weak Preterite of Valda 'To Have Power'*

Ol-d-a represents a later by-form⁹ of *olla*¹⁰ (< **wolpa* < **wulþō*). To be sure, it seems apparent that the introduction of the weak dental suffix in the preterite form *olla* > *ol-d-a* was due to analogy with the *ld*-type, as in *vil-da*, *skyl-da*, *skol-da* (inf. *skolla*, *ē*-class), etc. But if the *-d-* in *ol-d-a* were due solely to this analogy, then we should likewise have expected a secondary *-nd-* for *-nn-* (< **-np-*) in connection with such weak preterite forms as *kunna* (< **kunþa*): *unna* (< **unþa*) after the pattern of *-nd-* in the type *un-da* (inf. *una*, *ē*-class): *mun-da* (inf. *muna*), etc. But since these secondary forms, **kun-da* for *kunna*: **un-da* for *unna*, do not exist in OIcel., it is most probable that the form *ol-da* was not due solely to the influence of the *ld*-type, but that other factors were involved. One of these factors may have been the influence of the combination *-ld-* in the regular strong forms of the verb (cf. *valda*, present system, and *valdit*, past participle), where the *-d-* (< **-ð-*) represents an extension suffix¹¹ to the base **wal-*. That the weak-preterite forms stood under the influence of the strong forms is clear from the borrowing of initial *v-*, as in the

⁹ Cf. Noreen, *op. cit.*, §526.

¹⁰ Cf. Hermann Collitz, *Das schwache Präteritum, Hesperia*, Vol. I (Göttingen, 1914), §29, p. 61.

¹¹ Cf. S. Feist, *Vergl. Wtb. der got. Sprache*³ (Leiden, 1936), p. 548, under *waldan*.

by-forms *volla:valda*.¹² The influence of the *-d-* of the strong forms is all the more probable in that *-d-* likewise functioned as the preterite suffix of weak verbs. Hence, in view of the discrepancy (discussed above) between *olla* > *ol-da:vil-da* and *kunna*: never **kun-da*, the suffix *-d-* in the preterite form *ol-da* seems best explained as due to the combined influence of the *ld*-type and of the *ld*-combination in the strong forms *valda:valdit*.

VII. The Element *-vegi* in the Compound *Qnd-vegi* 'High Seat'

The element *-vegi* may be derived from **wag-ja*, neuter *ja*-stem, meaning 'that which is moved, raised' (cf. Goth. [*ga*]-*wagjan* 'to move'). The original sense of *qnd-vegi* could then have been 'that which is raised opposite (*and-*), on both sides'.¹³ Since *-vegi* belongs to the short-neuter *ja*-stems, we might have expected the form **veg* (**wag-ja* > **veg* as **kun-ja* > *kyn*). But the *i*-suffix in *-veg-i* is easily explained as borrowed from the long-neuter *ja*-stems (cf. **kvād-ja* > *kvæð-i*). Such a borrowing most frequently occurs in compounds which have a collective sense¹⁴ (cf. *ung-viði* 'young trees' like *ung-menni* 'young men'). The collective sense of the compound *qnd-vegi* is obvious from the fact that the *qnd-vegi* has reference to the whole structure, including the two seats or benches opposite each other (*bekkr úðri* and *bekkr øðri*); compare Germ. *Gebäude*¹⁵ 'building,' neut. *a*-stem with collective force.

VIII. The Form *Fúss* 'Eager'

The form *fúss*, instead of phonetically correct **fóss* (< **funs* = OHG *funs*), is attributed¹⁶ either (1) to the influence of the

¹² With *valda:olda* cf. the type *senda:senda*, where the *-d-* in the preterite form *sen-d-a* (< **send-da* < **send-ða*) functions both as a part of the stem and as a preterite suffix.

¹³ Cf. Finnur Jónsson, *Lex. Poet.*, p. 661^b, s.v.: "... egl. betyr det vel 'hvad der hæver sig overfor hinanden, på to sider,' jfr de to højsæder ..."

¹⁴ Cf. Noreen, *op. cit.*, §372.

¹⁵ Regarding these neuter *ja*-compounds in ON Kluge (*op. cit.*, §65) says: "In wirklichkeit liegen aber hier vielfach bildungen des §66 [i.e., the type *ga- -ja* in Germ. *Ge-bäud-e*] vor, da *ga-* im an. vor beginn der schrift in der regel verklungen ist."

¹⁶ For these views cf. especially Noreen, *op. cit.*, §112, Anm. 1; Heusler, *op. cit.*, §82, Anm.; Holthausen, *Aisl. Elementarb.*, §26, Anm. For a different explanation cf. A. Kock, *Arkiv*, Vol. XV (1899), pp. 323-336.

compound δ -*fúss*, where by virtue of the unaccented syllable the lowering of the vowel $u > o$ (after the disappearance of the n before s) did not take place (i.e., $-\ast funsar > -\ast fúsR > -fúss$, instead of $-\ast funsar > -\ast fōsR > -\ast fōss$), or (2) to the influence of the denominative verb $\ast funsjan > \ast fúsjan > fýsa$ 'to make eager.'

(1) If the simplex form $\ast fōss$ was displaced by the form $-fúss$ in δ -*fúss*, then the compound δ -*fúss* must have been used much more frequently than the simplex $\ast fōss$, for otherwise we should expect the reverse analogy to have taken place (viz., $\ast fōss$, hence $\ast \delta$ -*fōss*¹⁷). It is not a priori likely that the compound negative form δ -*fúss* occurred more frequently than the simplex $\ast fōss$. The hypothesis that the simplex form *fúss* was due to the influence of the compound δ -*fúss* has no factual support and must therefore be considered as a mere assumption due to the identity of form between simplex and compound.

(2) Both Noreen and Heusler recognize the possibility that the simplex form *fúss* owes its vowel \acute{u} to the influence of the derivative verb $fýsa < \ast fúsjan < \ast funsjan$. Both scholars¹⁸ assume that the influence took place at a time before the \acute{u} was umlauted to \acute{y} (i.e., before $\ast fúsjan$ became $fýsa$). Such an assumption is not necessary, for since \acute{y} is the result of i -umlaut of \acute{u} , the simplex form $\ast fōss$ could have been supplanted by *fúss* according to the normal proportion $hýsa:hús$, hence $fýsa:fúss$ (instead of $\ast fōss$) after the time of $\ast fúsjan > fýsa$. The normal proportion $\acute{y}:\acute{u}$ between verb and adjective at the same time resulted in a leveling of the adjectival form in the simplex and compound (i.e., $\ast fōss:-fúss$ became $fúss:-fúss$), which result was likewise in keeping with the normal conditions (i.e., no variation in form between the simplex and the adjective in the compound; cf. $gladr:\delta$ -*gladr*, *lkr*: δ -*lkr*, *trauðr*: δ -*trauðr* with $fúss:\delta$ -*fúss*).

The obvious conclusion is then that the analogy which resulted in the displacement of the simplex form $\ast fōss$ by *fúss* had its point of departure not in the influence of the corresponding

¹⁷ A few relicts of this analogy occur in the proper name *Öl-föss* and in OSwed. *fös*:*fram-fös*; cf. A. Kock, *op. cit.*, p. 325.

¹⁸ Cf. Noreen, *ibid.*: "Das vereinzelte *fúss* . . . dürfte sein \acute{u} von $\ast fúsir$ vor dessen übergang in *fýser* gelüftet u. dgl. entlehnt haben." Heusler, *ibid.*: "... (oder nach dem Vb. $\ast fúsjan$ [$> fýsa$] "antreiben," wo das j hinderte)."

form *-fúss* in the compound *ó-fúss* but in the verbal form *fýsa*. This conclusion is based upon two vital factors, viz., (1) the analogical vowel proportion¹⁹ *ú:ý* between *fúss* and *fýsa*, and (2) the improbability that the compound form *ó-fúss* was used more frequently than the simplex **fóss* and thus displaced it through leveling. The first hypothesis is in accord with a plausible analogy, whereas the second hypothesis has no precedent to support it.

IX. The Assimilation of *þk* > *kk*

The combination *þk* usually remained unchanged through association with the *ð(þ)* of the derivative form (cf. *blíðr:blíþka*, *víðr:víþka*, etc.). But where this association was no longer present, *þk* became assimilated to *kk* (cf. the proper names **Hróð-kell* > **Hróþkell* > *Hrókkell*, **Boð-ke* > **Bopke* > *Bokke*).

Noreen,²⁰ however, postulates an intermediate stage *tk* between *þk* and *kk* (i.e., **Hróþkell* > **Hrótkell* > *Hrókkell*, **Bopke* > **Botke* > *Bokke*), whereby the secondary *tk* was assimilated to *kk* like primary *tk* > *kk* (cf. *et-ki* > *ekki*).

Since this intermediate stage *tk* does not exist, it is of course impossible to disprove Noreen's hypothesis. Against it, however, is the fact that in a combination of spirant plus stop the spirant was not usually shifted to the corresponding stop unless both consonants belonged to the same variety (cf., e.g., the two dentals *ð+t*, *þ+t* > *tt*, **glaðt* > **giapt* > *glatt*). In the combination (*ft*) > *pt* (cf. *oft* > *opt*) the *p* represents merely an orthographical device for denoting the bilabial character of PGmc *f* (Goth. *aúftō*) before *t*.²¹ The only possible parallel to Noreen's *þk* > *tk* is the shift of secondary *ht* (< *zt*) > *kt* (cf. **sazt* > **saht* > *sakt*, **heilazt* > **heilajt* > *heilakt*). On the other hand, there is no evidence that secondary *þk* (< *ðk*), as in the forms in question, was treated any differently from original *þk* (cf. *maði* [= Goth. *mapa*]: *mapkr* > **makkr* > Norw.-Swed. dialectic *makke*). There-

¹⁹ That the *s* in the stem **funs* may have contributed to the displacement of **fós-s* by *fúss* according to the proportion *hús:hýsa* (hence *fúss:fýsa*) is rendered plausible from the fact that *ðsk* (*ýskja*) was not replaced by **úsk* (= OSwed.-ODan. *úsk*) according to the proportion *ú:ý*.

²⁰ Cf. *op. cit.*, §§238, 2b; 274.

²¹ Cf. Heusler, *op. cit.*, §159.

fore, it seems unnecessary, if not unwarranted, to assume an intermediate stage *tk* in order to account for the assimilation of *pk* > *kk*, especially since this direct assimilation is in keeping with the type *ht* > *tt* (cf. **sōhta* > *sōtta*, so **Bopke* > *Bokke*).

X. *The Simplification of -tt (<*-ht) in Knēs-bót and Sót(t)*

(a) *Knēs-bót* (<*-*bōtt* < *-*būht*) 'Kniehöhle, back part of the knee-joint.' The word also appears in the form *knēs-fót* (<*-*bōtt*) with shift of **ð* > *f* after *s*.²² It is possible that the simplification of *tt* > *t* had its point of departure in a form **knēs-fōtt*, where the element *-*fōtt* could have been associated with the independent word *fót*- 'foot,' which likewise represents a part of the body connected with the leg. The fact that the element *-*fōtt* was in an unaccented syllable (cf. **ey-vett* > *ey-vel*) may have contributed to the simplification.

(b) *Sót(t)* (<*-*suht*:-Goth. *sauhts*) > *sót* may be due to the influence of *sút* 'grief, care,' which, although derived from the same stem (**suht*-) as is *sótt*, always appears in OIcel. with single *t*. The single *t* in *sút*, over against *tt* in *sótt*, may be explained as due to the influence of the denominative verb *sýta* 'to have care, be concerned.' The phonetically correct form **sýtta* (<*-*suhtjan*) could have been displaced by *sýta* with single *t* after the analogy of those weak *jan*-verbs whose stem ended in *t* and which therefore had -*tt*- in the preterite (cf. *spýta*:*spýtta*, hence *sýta*²³ [instead of **sýtta*]:*sýtta*). Thus, *sýta*:*sút* may have led to *sót*, alongside phonetically correct *sótt*, especially since *sút* denotes a transferred sense of *sótt*, viz., 'sickness of mind, care, grief.'

XI. *The Loss of Initial j before Vowels*

Primary initial *j* (=PGmc *ǰ*) before vowels disappeared in the preliterary era²⁴ (cf. Goth. *jer*, *juk*, *juggs* > ON *ár*, *ok*, *ung*). Since the *j* disappeared irrespective of the quality of the following vowel, this loss must be attributed solely to conditions of accentuation.

²² Cf. Noreen, *op. cit.*, §237, 1.

²³ Cf. *brátt(t)a*:*nútt(t)a*, etc.; see Noreen, *op. cit.*, §267, Anm. 1.

²⁴ Probably between the years 550-650; see Noreen, *op. cit.*, §231, Anm. 2.

The *j* was a spirant and therefore non-syllabic and incapable of producing a diphthong in conjunction with a following vowel; i.e., **jār*, **jok*, **jung* represented a one-mora syllable. Hence, the initial *j* did not receive the full force of the expiratory accent, which rested upon the following vowel. Just as, e.g., the original initial spirant *X* before a stressed vowel became weakened in articulation to a mere breathing *h* (cf. **Xabain* > *hafa*), so the initial spirant *j* before a stressed vowel must have been weakened in articulation before it finally disappeared. But since the spirant *j* is also a semivowel, its complete disappearance in the pre-literary era may be parallel to the loss of pure vowels in the unaccented verbal prefixes, which likewise occurred in the pre-literary period. In these verbal prefixes it is certain that the vowels and not the consonants were the first to disappear, for the latter were often preserved if they resulted in an already existing combination (cf. **bi-grátan* > **bgráta* > *gráta*, but **garatðjan* > *greiða*). The example of the verbal prefixes supports the contention that the loss of initial *j* in the type **jār* was due to the fact that the semivowel *j* did not receive the main stress, which rested upon the following vowel. Furthermore, there is no reason why the semivowel *j* should not suffer apocope parallel to that of the pure vowel *i* in initial position as well as in an unaccented syllable following the main stress (cf. **dómjan* > *dóma*; **dómiðð* > *dómda*).

In further support of the contention that the loss of initial *j* in the type **jār* was due to lack of accentuation is the fact that secondary initial *j*, which was always preserved, represents an earlier stressed vowel (*i* or *e*) of a diphthong either original (cf. **tuðura* > **tuðr* > *júr*, Germ. *Euler*, OFris. *iader*) or due to breaking (cf. **erðu* > **éorðu* > *jorð*). Secondary initial *j* represents therefore simply the continuance of prehistoric conditions through the shift of the stressed initial vowel *i*(*e*) to unstressed *j* because of the shift from rising to falling diphthong (cf. *iú* > *iú* > *jú*). If the resultant *j* in the type *júr*, *jorð* had been lost according to the same law of accentuation as primary *j* in the type **jār* had been lost, then the continuity with earlier phonetic conditions would have been broken. Such conditions did not exist in the case of primary initial *j* (=PGmc. *ǰ*).

The apparent discrepancy between the loss and the retention of initial *j* before vowels may be formulated as follows:

(1) Primary initial *j* (= PGmc. *ǰ*) before vowels was lost because of weakened articulation in initial position.²⁵

(2) Secondary initial *j* before vowels was exempted from this loss because secondary initial *j* represents the continuance of the initial *stressed* vowel of an earlier diphthong.

(3) Loss of secondary initial *j* before vowels, due to analogy with the loss of primary initial *j* before vowels, was not possible because primary *j* had already disappeared long before secondary *j* had developed. On the other hand, it was possible for a secondary analogical *j* to replace a primary *j* which had disappeared (cf. *jā*, *jātta*, footnote 25).

²⁵ An apparent exception to this law is the initial *j* in the forms *jā* 'yes': *jāt(t)a*, *jā* 'to affirm, agree to.' Edvald Lidén (*Arkiv*, Vol. III [1886], pp. 238 and 240) has offered convincing evidence that the verbal forms *jātta*, *jā* were most likely not derived from the adverbial form *jā* but from a root **jeh-* (cf. OHG *jēhan* 'to affirm'): **jehljan* > **jihlan* > **ihtan* > **ehta* > **jahta* > *jātta*; **jehan* > **ehan* > **ēa* > *jā*. The initial *j* in the verbal forms *jātta*, *jā* could then represent a secondary *j* (which is regularly preserved) and therefore is not parallel to the primary *j* in *jā* (Goth. *ja*, OHG-OS *jā*, OE *3ea*). The retention of this primary initial *j* Lidén explains (pp. 235-237) as due to its usage as the second element of iterative compounds, such as *jājā*, *jēja*. According to Lidén the phonetically correct *j* of the second element of these compounds was transferred to the simplex form, supplanting the phonetically correct form **ā* (< **jā*) by *jā*. But this assumption is contrary to the laws of analogy, for if the simplex form borrowed its initial *j* from the medial *j* of the compounds, then we must assume that the compounds were used much more frequently than the simplex. The evidence in OIcel.—only four examples occur—is overwhelmingly in favor of the reversed conditions. It is therefore far more likely that the initial *j* in the adverbial form *jā* was due to borrowing from the verbal forms *jātta*, *jā*, which because of their meaning were felt to be derived from *jā*. At any rate, a borrowing of secondary *j* would satisfactorily explain the anomalous form *jā* instead of phonetically correct **ā*. The verbal form *jāta* (with single *-t-*) Lidén (p. 238) considers to be of different origin from the form *jātta* (with double *-tt-*); i.e., **jā-atjan* (= OHG [gi-] *jāzan*) > **jēltjan* > **ēta* re-formed to *jāta* under the influence of the adverbial form *jā*. But such an assumption is unwarranted, for the form *jāta* could have been the result of analogy after the pattern of the type *spyta*: *spytta* (pret.); hence *jāta* (instead of *jātta*): *jātta* (pret.). Lidén's assumptions are not always convincing, but his analysis suggests the plausibility that initial *j* in *jā*, *jāt(t)a* represents a secondary *j* and not the continuance of the primary *j*.

THE NORSEMEN AT LUNA

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE
Princeton, New Jersey

READERS of Wace's rhymed chronicle will recall the famous stratagem adopted by the Norseman Hasting in order to overwhelm the Tuscan city of Luna and to destroy it utterly.¹ Wace, as is well known, drew largely on the Latin chronicle of Dudo of St. Quentin, who wrote about the year 1000.² The same episode is repeated in the chronicle of William of Jumièges, composed between 1026 and 1028,³ in the rhymed chronicle of Benolt of St. Maur,⁴ and in the *Flores historiarum* of Matthew of Westminster, who wrote in the reign of Edward III.⁵ The *Saga of Ragnar Lodbrók* mentions the capture of Luna but keeps silent about the stratagem.⁶

The episode itself may be summarized as follows:

Having besieged the town of Luna in vain for a considerable period, Hasting suggested to his companions the following stratagem. He feigned to be ill and asked for baptism. On the following day his followers declared that he had died and requested Christian burial for him. The governor and bishop fell into the trap: they had the body conducted in solemn procession to the monastery located in the middle of the city and a solemn mass celebrated in the chapel. Everything seemed to come off well when at the critical moment the "dead" man came to life; the mourners drew their swords (which they had carefully concealed) and massacred the townspeople. Then they sacked and utterly destroyed the town.

This thrilling story seems to have enjoyed considerable popularity among the Scandinavians and their descendants; witness the Danish History of Saxo Grammaticus, who tells it twice, ascribing it in both cases to his king, Frotho I:

¹ *Le Roman de Rou*, ed. H. Andresen, Heilbronn, 1877-1879, Vol. II, p. 147; cf. G. Koerting, *Ueber die Quellen des Roman de Rou*, Leipzig, 1867, p. 23.

² *Historia Normannorum*, ed. J. Lair (Caën, 1865), pp. 132 ff.

³ *De gestis ducum Normannicorum*, Vol. I, p. 10, in Migne, *P.L.* CXLIX, col. 786 f.

⁴ *Chronique des ducs de Normandie*, ed. Francisque Michel, Paris, 1836-1844, Vol. I, pp. 49 ff.

⁵ Ed. R. P. Luard, London, 1890, Vol. I, p. 467 (*Rev. Brit. med. aevi script.*, No. 95).

⁶ Cf. J. Steenstrup, *Normannerne*, København, 1876-1882, Vol. I, p. 26.

This done, he took his army to the city of Baltisca.⁷ Thinking no force could overcome it, he exchanged war for guile. He went into a dark and unknown hiding place, only a very few being in the secret, and ordered a report of his death to be spread abroad, so as to inspire the enemy with less fear; his obsequies being also held, and a barrow raised, to give the tale credit. Even the soldiers bewailed his supposed death with a mourning which was in the secret of the trick. This rumor led Vespasius, the king of the city, to show so faint and feeble a defense, as though the victory were already his, that the enemy got a chance of breaking in, and slew him as he sported at his ease.⁸

Again:

Then he attacked London, the most populous city of the island; but the strength of its walls gave him no chance of capturing it. Therefore he feigned to be dead, and his guile strengthened him. For Daleman, the governor of London, on hearing the false news of his death, accepted the surrender of the Danes, offered them a native general, and suffered them to enter the town, that they might choose him out of a great throng. They feigned to be making a careful choice, but beset Daleman in a night surprise and slew him.⁹

Quite true, in neither one of the two accounts is the stratagem exactly the same as the one recounted by Dudo and his derivatives; for no mention is made of the Norse chief's desire to be buried in the besieged town and of the mock funeral. Still, basically the story is the same, and there is likely to be some connection between these variants. Now it has repeatedly been pointed out that London is called *Lundunaborg* in Norse texts, while Luna is referred to as *Lunaborg*, and the conclusion has accordingly been drawn that the story was transferred from the less known Luna to the better known London, a fairly common occurrence in the evolution of stories.¹⁰

Nor does this exhaust the number of variants of our tale. Snorri Sturluson relates how King Harald Hardrade, about the year 1040, captured a castle in Sicily in much the same manner:¹¹

⁷ Baltisca is the town of Polock on the river Duna, in the government of Vitebsk; cf. R. Heinzel, *Ueber die Hervararsaga* (*Sitzungsber. d. Wiener Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Cl.*, Vol. CXIV (1887)), p. 64.

⁸ Ed. Holder, p. 41.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

¹⁰ Steenstrup, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 26 f.; Jan de Vries, *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, Vol. XV (1927), p. 90.

¹¹ *Haraldssaga Harðráða*, chap. 10; cf. J. de Vries, *Arkiv. f. nordisk Filo-*

The fourth castle which Harald came to was the greatest of all we have been speaking about. It was so strong that there was no possibility of breaking into it. They surrounded the castle, so that no supplies could get into it. When they had remained here a short time, Harald fell sick, and he betook himself to his bed. He had his tent put up a little ways from the camp; for he found quietness and rest away from the clamor and clang of armed men. His men went usually in companies to or from him to hear his orders; and the castle people observing there was something new among the Vaeringers, sent out spies to discover what this might mean. When the spies came back they had to tell of the illness of the commander of the Vaeringers, and that no assault on that account had been made on the castle.

A while after this Harald's strength began to fail, at which his men were very melancholy and cast down; all which was news to the castle-men. At last Harald's sickness increased so rapidly that his death was expected through all the army. Thereafter the Vaeringers went to the castle-men; told them in a parley of the death of their commander; and begged the priests to grant him burial in the castle. When the castle-people heard this news, there were many among them who ruled over cloisters or other great establishments within the place, and who were very eager to get the corpse for their church, knowing that upon that there would follow very rich presents. A great many priests therefore clothed themselves in all their robes, and went out of the castle with cross and shrine and relics, and formed a beautiful procession. The Vaeringers also made a great burial. The coffin was borne high in the air, and over it was a tent of costly linen, and before it were carried many banners.

Now when the corpse was brought within the castle gate the Vaeringers set down the coffin right across the entry, fixed a bar to keep the gates open and sounded to battle with all their trumpets and drew their swords. The whole army of the Vaeringers, fully armed, rushed from the camp to the assault of the castle with shout and cry, and the monks and other priests who had gone to meet the corpse and had striven with each other as to who should be the first to come out and take the offering at the burial, were now striving much more as to who should first get away from the Vaeringers; for they killed before their feet every one who was nearest, whether clerk or unconsecrated. The Vaeringers rummaged this castle so well that they killed all the men, pillaged everything, and made an enormous booty.

As will be readily seen, this text stands much closer to that of Dudo of St. Quentin and his successors, and it is probably no accident that the scene is again laid in Italy, though the time of the story is nearly two centuries later. What is certain is that our theme appears to have enjoyed a special popularity with the Normans settled in Southern Italy; for we find it again, this time

logi, Vol. XLVII (1931), pp. 56 f. on the variant reading presented by the *Morkinskinna*.

attributed to none other than Robert Guiscard, in the work of Guilelmus Apuliensis (end of the eleventh century), who reports that the Normans took a Calabrian fortress by means of the same stratagem:¹²

332 Qui cum discedens huc praedabundus et illuc
Non aliquod castrum posset captare vel urbem
Arte locum quemdam molitur adire, sed ejus
Difficilis consensus erat, quia plurimus hujus
Accola grex habitans, etiam monasticus illic
Non alienigenam quemus intrare sinebant.
Utile figmentum versutus adinvenit atque
Mandat defunctum quod quemlibet esse suorum
Gens sua testetur, qui cum, quasi mortuus esset,
Impositus feretro, pannusque obducere cera
Illitus hunc facie jussus latitante fuisset,
Ut Normannorum velare cadavera mos est,
Conduntur feretro sub tergo corporis enses.
Ad monasterii subhumandum limina corpus
Fertur, et ignaros fraudis, quos fallere vivi
Non poterant homines, defuncti fictio fallit,
Dumque videretur simplex modus exsequiarum,
Erigitur subito qui credebatur humanus.
Evaginatīs comitantes ensibus illum
Invasere loci deceptos arte colonos.
Quid facerent stolidi? nec se defendere possunt,
Quo fugiant nec habent, omnes capiuntur; et illic
Praesidium castri primum, Roberte, locasti;
Non monasterii tamen est eversio facta,
Non exstirpatus grex est monasticus inde.

It so happens that this feat is placed by the chronicler at an interval of some ten years after the exploit of Harald Hardrade.¹³

This does not mean that our theme did not find favor outside of Scandinavia and Italy: after all, the rhymed chronicles of Wace and Benoît enjoyed much popularity among people not familiar with Latin, and thus it is not astonishing that our stratagem was incorporated in the *chanson de geste* known under the

¹² Migne, *P.L.* CXLIX, col. 1046; cf. Ferdinand Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile*, Paris, 1907, Vol. I, pp. xxxviii-xl. On Guilelmus Apuliensis cf. also Roger Wilmans, *Archiv d. Gesellsch. f. ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, Vol. X (1851), pp. 87-121.

¹³ De Vries, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

title of *Jehan de Lanson*, a work of the thirteenth century. There the citadel of Lanson is taken in much the same manner: Roland plays the dead man and is placed on a bier, his good sword Durandal beside him. The twelve peers, in deep mourning, gain admission into the castle. Then the "dead" man all of a sudden leaps up; the mourners draw their swords and massacre the garrison.¹⁴

In England our stratagem survived in the *Hyde Book* (written probably before 1136). The hero of this episode is the Anglo-Saxon Hereward, who is said to have gained admission to a castle by simulating a corpse and having himself carried into the church for burial. Leaping up from the bier, he makes himself master of the stronghold.¹⁵

More than half a century ago the Danish scholar Johannes Steenstrup pointed out that the story is one of those which are easily transplanted from one country to another,¹⁶ and it is clear from the examples reviewed that the Normans themselves were the propagators of the tale, no doubt because it was calculated to flatter their national pride and to impress the listeners if by chance they happened to be aliens.¹⁷ None the less, it is equally certain that the story must have started somewhere, and our task is to enquire into the origin of the oldest known variant, which is the account of Dudo of St. Quentin.

It is fairly well established that the Norsemen did enter the Mediterranean through the Strait of Gibraltar and that they plundered both Christian and Moorish territory with fair impartiality. It is also known that Luna was taken by the Saracens as early as 849,¹⁸ while the Norse invasion of the Mediterranean is placed by the Moorish chroniclers in the year 245 (April 8, 859–March 27, 860). It is possible that Dudo, as he is known to have done in other instances, transferred to

¹⁴ Léon Gautier, *Les Épopées françaises*, Paris, 1878–1897, Vol. III, p. 263.

¹⁵ H. G. Leach, *Angevin Britain and Scandinavia*, Cambridge, Mass., 1921, p. 349.

¹⁶ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁷ Henri Prentout, *Étude critique sur Dudo de Saint-Quentin*, Paris, 1916, p. 57; de Vries, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

¹⁸ *Ann. Bert.*, ed. Waitz, p. 37.

the Norsemen an exploit of the Saracens; for he is the only independent chronicler to mention the capture of Luna by Hasting and his Norsemen. However this may be, the question arises: How did Dudo hit upon the stratagem adopted, since he is the first to mention it?

Obviously two possibilities must be considered: (1) The Norsemen were familiar with the stratagem; they actually used it in the capture of Luna or reported that they had so used it, to impress their audience. (2) The Norsemen, or their panegyrists, heard of this stratagem or of the motive on which it is based and ascribed it to themselves.

Now it is certainly a curious coincidence, and one which has never been pointed out thus far, that a similar story about a mock funeral, but wholly unconnected with the Norsemen, indeed not connected with any war or siege, was current in Italy by the fourteenth century, being told in order to account for the complete destruction of the Etruscan city of Luni, situated at the mouth of the Magra, on the confines of Tuscany and Liguria, i.e., the very city the destruction of which Dudo attributes to Hasting and his Norsemen. The Italian account reads as follows:¹⁹

The lord of Luni was a young and handsome man, adorned with that type of male beauty which is known not to leave female hearts indifferent. Now it happened that an emperor came to live in that neighborhood with his wife, who promptly fell in love with the young lord. Her passion was reciprocated, and the couple agreed upon a ruse to satisfy their desire. The wife feigned death and was duly buried. The prince broke into the tomb and eloped with her. Unfortunately, the injured husband was not slow in discovering the trick; he had the two lovers slain and the city levelled to the ground.

Such is the tale as related by Leandro Alberti, a Renaissance writer. In his text he cites three stanzas from the *Dittamondo* of Fazio degli Uberti.²⁰ These, and an allusion to the same story in Petrarch's *Itinerarium Syriacum*, in which Luni is compared with Troy as an example of the perils brought on by the sin of

¹⁹ Leandro Alberti, *Descrizione di tutta l'Italia*. Venetia, 1581, fol. 26a; cf. A. Wesselski, *Märchen des Mittelalters*, Berlin, 1925, p. 198.

²⁰ On this writer and his work cf. K. Vossler, *Italienische Literaturgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 51.

luxury, prove that the story was known, at least in Tuscany, as early as the fourteenth century. Dante (*Par.* XVI. 73) refers to Luni as to a city completely destroyed; but he does not mention the story. He may have known it, since a fellow-citizen and contemporary of his, the chronicler Giovanni Villani, alludes to it.²¹ Giovanni Sercambi does not speak of an emperor and his wife, but of a royal couple, Astechi and Tamiris, who land at Luni, while the fair lady's paramour is not the lord of Luni, but a simple innkeeper.²²

This queer story has long been recognized as a variant of the Byzantine romance about King Solomon and his unfaithful wife.²³ We do not know how it came to be localized at Luni; but it is clear that it was to explain the complete destruction of the city. Thus we have two stories, both relating a mock funeral, which account for the disaster which overtook the ancient Etruscan town: (1) The Norman Dudo of St. Quentin speaks of a stratagem; the man feigning to be dead is the Viking chief Hasting. (2) The Italians refer to the ruse of a disloyal wife who outwitted her husband and eloped with her lover. The outcome, however, is the same in both accounts: the city is destroyed.

Obviously, these two stories, both localized at Luni, cannot have arisen independently, but must somehow be connected. So the question arises: How is this coincidence to be explained? There are two alternatives: (1) The tale related by Dudo was also known in Italy; but the Italians, not relishing the thought of being represented as outwitted by a foxy Norseman, replaced it by a variant of the Solomon legend, which also had the episode of a mock funeral. (2) The variant of the Solomon romance had been localized at Luni prior to the year 1000; Dudo (or his source) heard it but altered it, transforming the love intrigue into a stratagem redounding to the resourcefulness and craftiness of the Norse warrior chief.

Let us now look at the respective probabilities of these two alternatives. Dudo and his derivatives, so far as they relate the

²¹ *Cronaca*, Vol. I, p. 50.

²² Ed. Renier, Torino, 1889, pp. 426 f.

²³ Wesselski, *op. cit.*, pp. 197 f.; F. Vogt, *Salman und Marolf*, Halle, 1880, p. xxii.

fall and destruction of Luni, are writers appealing only to North Europeans; they are never quoted by Italian authors, and the extant MSS of their works are even now found in libraries north of the Alps. None of the Italian variants of the stratagem localizes it in Tuscany. In short, there is nothing to indicate that the Italians were ever familiar with Dudo's account of the capture of Luni.

The situation is quite different if we assume the second of the alternatives to hold. The story of Solomon and his disloyal wife was known from Byzantium to the Atlantic.²⁴ As for the variant localized in Tuscany, we know that Northerners, were they pilgrims or soldiers, eagerly listened to the yarns told them by the ciceroni in the Italian cities; witness the story of the *Caballus Constantini* in Rome²⁵ and the cycle of Vergil the Necromancer.²⁶ It is therefore quite likely that some Norman, in travelling to Rome, was told the tale of the destruction of Luni and that he, or some other Norman to whom he related what he had heard, remembering that the same city was reported to have been captured by the Norsemen some time in the ninth century, altered the tale by transforming it into a stratagem and making it fit into the frame of the siege and capture of Luni by his own compatriots.

²⁴ Cf. *Revue Hispanique*, Vol. LXXVIII (1930), pp. 489-543.

²⁵ *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. XXXVIII (1923), pp. 164-168.

²⁶ *Speculum*, Vol. X (1935), pp. 111-116.

IBSEN'S MÖLLEFOSS

NORMAN L. WILLEY
University of Michigan

GERMAN literary scholarship has taught us the proper liturgical attitude to assume in approaching a genius, and some of us have practiced it so zealously that we never remove our noses from the dust long enough to note whether our idol has mourning under his fingernails. As an American, I am constitutionally inhibited from bending my spine sufficiently to be entirely inconspicuous among the worshippers, and I have several times been made to feel that my non-conformity is not entirely approved by my colleagues.

Thus, I am not surprised by the wave of indignation (cf. *Scandinavian Studies*, Vol. 17 [1943]: A. E. Zucker, pp. 309-312, and Einar Haugen, pp. 313-316) that my modest little article on inadvertencies of Ibsen (*Scandinavian Studies*, Vol. 17 [1943], pp. 269-281) has caused.

It is, of course, quite fatuous to argue about matters of taste; according to the reader's personality one feature or another of a universal genius, like Ibsen, will be most admired—I like Dr. Stockmann. I will enter into no quarrel about literary criticism. I even agree in principle with Zucker: Ibsen would have cared very little about suggestions such as mine; for he was much more interested in presenting his ideas than in observing pedantic details, as Haugen maintains. However, I cannot accept without further documentation one or two of the objections raised.

That Nora could have been prosecuted for forgery would seem precluded by *Almindelig Borgerlig Straffelov*, 3dje kapitel, §10: "På den, der ei har handlet med forsett, kommer ikke denne lovs straffebestemmelser til anvendelse, medmindre det uttrykkelig er bestemt eller utvetydig forutsatt, at også den uaktomme handling er straffbar."

The court would grant a motion for dismissal immediately. However, supposing the defendant had no better counsel than the Ibsen lawyers, Helmer, Krogstad, or Stensgård, and the court allowed the prosecution under §182: "Den, som i rettsstridig

hensikt benytter som ekte eller uforsket et eftergjort eller forfalsket dokument, eller som medvirker hertil, straffes med fengsel inntil 2 år, men inntil 4 år, når der handles om et innenlandsk eller utenlandsk offentlig dokument. Under særdeles formildende omstændigheter kan bøter anvendes."

It would immediately come out in the evidence that the forgery was committed some seven years before the initiation of the trial, and for its own credit the court (whether the defense lawyer knew his business or not) would have to dismiss the case under §§66 and 67:

66. "Adgangen til å reise straffesak eller avsi straffedom bortfaller . . . ved foreldelse overensstemmende med nedenstående regler."

67. "Til foreldelse utkreves ved straffbare handlinger, for hvilke den høieste lovbestemte straff er . . . fengsel inntil 2 år, 5 år."

Under the contemporary law Nora's contract would have been voidable, so Krogstad insisted upon the signature of her father and he subsequently forces her to admit *in private* that she herself signed the father's name. This confession, however, was not made before witnesses, so Krogstad would have been obliged to *prove* the forgery in court; his hearsay evidence would have been inadmissible. A similar case occurs in Bojer's *Troens Magt*, where a man denies his own signature and there is no mention of evidence by handwriting experts. No real Krogstad would have dared to make public his accusation for fear of the strict law against defamation of character, and no real lawyer would have been bowled over by the blackmailing letter.

The improbability of the whole transaction was ridiculed in the London *Punch* as follows:

"Krogstad: . . . Your father, being a shady Government official, without a penny—for, if he had possessed one, he would, presumably, have left it to you—without a penny, then, I as a cautious man of business, insisted upon his signature as a surety. Oh, we Norwegians are sharp fellows!"

Of course, few people who see *The Doll's House* ever concern themselves with the validity of the legal aspect, and I cannot take exception to Dr. Zucker's analysis; still I believe if Ibsen

had been well grounded in the law he would have varied a detail or two to make the case against Nora a good one.

As to the meaning of Ibsen's *møllefoss*, I have no doubt that any 'sansei' Norwegian would agree with Haugen that the word means a waterfall with a mill beside it somewhere or other. However, after reading *Rosmersholm* I imagine most people would come to the conclusion that Ibsen used the word for *møllerenne*. It is hardly likely that the prosperous Rosmer family would have chosen a home site in the immediate vicinity of a noisy and dangerous waterfall. Moreover, anyone of observance would know that a bridge over a waterfall would never be called a *klopp*; so long and substantial a structure would be a *bro*. Incidentally, this *klopp* had a handrail on one side only, as is clear from Rosmer's remark: . . . "Nu luder du dig ud over ræk-værket!," and from the final scene where Rosmer and his soul mate hold each other in their arms and step off into the water. Even in Norway a bridge over a cataract would be better safeguarded.

Haugen seems to be the first to suggest that the *møllefoss* is anything but the mill race; the exceedingly careful Archer translation, for example, has *mill race*; the authoritative German translation has *Graben*; Weigand has *mill-race*, and the very painstaking commentary of Woerner (*Henrik Ibsen*, 1910) calls it *Mühlbach*.

Ibsen was familiar with mills from his childhood in Skien, and probably his mother used to caution him not to go too close to the *møllefoss*. At any rate this word sounds more dangerous than *møllerenne*. With Ibsen's simple directness in mind I can see at present no cause for his using *møllefoss* at all, if all he meant was simply *foss*.

In Rebecca's words: ". . . når de fisker mig op For jeg vil ikke gerne bli' liggende der nede" we see a reason for the *mølle*; her body was to be "fished up" out of the deep and quiet mill pool under the wheel; if she had committed suicide in a rapid mountain stream her corpse would have been washed ashore or stranded in the shallow water and the "fisket op" would have been malapropos.

Haugen quotes (p. 314) from the *Riksmåls-Ordbok* the phrase

"gå i fossen" as a clinching argument that *foss* means a waterfall in *Rosmersholm*. I wonder if he also read the quotation from Ibsen (*Dikte*, 91): "Sjøen stod inn som en foss," and the alternative definition: *noget som fosser, bruser avsted i rivende fart*.

As to the Ekdals' artificial forest of dried Christmas trees in the attic and their dangerous habit of discharging fire arms among them, I am sure that the Norwegian authorities would have been much more exacting than would our American officers. Wooden houses are much more used there than here, and the many terrible conflagrations from which Norwegian towns have suffered have made the Norwegians much more conscious of fire risks than we are. The attic was rented, not owned, by the Ekdals, and the house must have been a large one; besides the unfinished part of the attic there were a large studio and at least four other rooms on this floor. Consequently, there must have been several other occupants of this big house, who, as well as the owner, would have been vitally interested in the obviation of so apparent and so dangerous a fire hazard as a doddering old drunkard shooting his rabbits among the dried Christmas trees.

As to the crashing fir tree in *Peer Gynt* it is pretty evident that an actual presentation on the stage would have produced a laugh from the spectators. The whole *dramatisk digt* floats back and forth from stern reality to purest phantasy, but the whole episode of the draft-dodger is strictly real; there are no trolls in this story of the man who was really "sig selv." That he should have stolen up to so noisy a place for his unlawful self-mutilation seems to be an inadvertency under any circumstances. The incident of Peer's felling the tree and that of the mutilation were probably produced independently of each other, and in the patching together the poet did not notice the little inconsistency.

REVIEW

Sweden, A Wartime Survey, edited and published in Sweden with the assistance of public authorities, distributed by the American-Swedish News Exchange, Inc., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, vi+250 pages, not counting thirty pages of illustrations.

This book gives an up-to-date picture of Sweden from many different points of view. The articles are written by prominent persons, intimately associated with the political, industrial, economic, social, or religious institutions that are discussed.

Karl Hildebrand, former Editor-in-chief of Stockholms Dagblad, Head of the National Debt Office from 1925-1940, has contributed an article on *The King*, in which is explained the cooperation of the monarch with his people through democratic processes. Elis Håstad, Associate Professor of Government, Uppsala University, Editor-in-chief of Svensk Tidskrift, Member of the Riksdag, writes on *The Political System*, discussing the most important public bodies and constitutional principles.

Captain Georg Holmin of the General Staff has a chapter on *The Defense of Neutrality*, giving figures indicating the increase in the military budget and the methods of defense. Colonel Gustaf Petri writes about *The Home Guard*, among the duties of which are: guarding airplanes that have made forced landings, fighting forest fires, and meeting unexpected emergencies. Colonel Gottfrid Björck, Head of Military Information and Press Bureau, in his article on *Social Welfare Work for the Soldiers*, shows how suitable recreation is provided for the soldiers' leisure hours and how educational study is encouraged.

The Home Front is described by Ragnar Lund, Head of Home Division, State Information Board. It is purely a Swedish front, without any alien minorities. The women's auxiliary corps, known as the "Lotta Movement," is useful in canteen work, nursing, airplane spotting, making and repairing garments, and the like. *Physical Training* is the topic treated by Colonel Bertil G:son Ugglä, a prize winner in Olympic games, Commander of Karlberg Military Academy. Sven Tunberg, President of the University of Stockholm, has written an informative chapter on *The Wartime Economic Administration*, while Herman Eriksson, Minister of Commerce, discusses *Foreign Trade*.

The Food Supply, a most important matter in war and peace, is clearly presented in figures and tables by Axel Gjörës, Minister of Supply. *The Consumer Cooperatives*, which in the Scandinavian countries constitute an economic factor of national importance,

are explained by Thorsten Odhe, Editor-in-chief of *Kooperatören*, while *The Fuel Problem* receives adequate treatment from Erik Lundh, Chairman of the State Fuel Commission. *Electric Light and Power* is the title of a chapter written by Åke Rusck, Manager of the Operating Department, Royal Board of Waterfalls. The electric power supply situation has developed satisfactorily, due to fruitful cooperation among the Government authorities, the municipalities, and private enterprises.

Industrial Readjustments are explained by Ingvar Svennilson, Director of the Institute of Industrial Research, who shows how the shrinkage of imports has necessitated a rapid expansion of raw-material production. Rolf Steenhoff, Chairman of the Swedish Association of Engineers and Architects, has as his theme *The Manufacture of Substitutes*. *Shipping and Transportation* is discussed by Axel Granholm, Chairman of the State Transportation Commission; *The Money Market*, by Klas Bööck, Head of Statistical Department, Bank of Sweden; *The Labor Market*, by Alf Johansson, Chief of Research Bureau, Government Social Welfare Board; *The Trade Unions* by Ragnar Casparsson, Chief Press Officer, Swedish Trade Union Federation.

Erling Eidem, Archbishop of Sweden, gives an interesting account of *The Swedish Church*; Sten Dehlgren, Editor-in-chief of *Dagens Nyheter*, says in his chapter on *The Press*, that journalists must exercise the freedom which the Constitution guarantees in a spirit of responsibility and be capable of self-discipline.

The importance of radio in Sweden is shown in *Radio Broadcasting*, by Yngve Hugo, Managing Director of the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation; *University Life* is described by Margareta Vestin, former President of the Women Students' Association, Uppsala University. Georg Svensson, Editor-in-chief of *Bonnier's Literary Magazine*, writes on *Literature*; Erik Wettergren, former Head of Royal Dramatic Theatre, Director of the National Museum of Art, has contributed the chapters on *The Fine Arts* and *The Theatre*; Johannes Norrby, Managing Director, Stockholm Concert Society, prepared the final chapter of the book, *Music*.

The illustrations are appropriately chosen to fit the subject matter. The book as a whole offers a clear and vivid picture of Sweden today.

JOSEPH ALEXIS
University of Nebraska

